

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING UNDER 37 CFR 1.8
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically
filed with the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office on 29 October 2007.

/Brianna Dahlberg/
Brianna Dahlberg

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of inventor(s):

Bart A. Meltzer et al.

Application No. 09/633,365

Group Art Unit: 2141

Examiner: Kenneth R. Coulter

Confirmation No. 3951

Filing Date: 07 August 2000

CUSTOMER NO. 22470

Title: **Registry for Trading Partners Using
Documents for Commerce in Trading
Partner Networks**

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Sir:

Applicants appreciate the courtesy extended by Examiner Coulter during an interview on Monday, October 15, 2007 at approximately 4 p.m.

During the interview we discussed the pair of references cited in the last office action, specifically Olsen and Bryan. We identified a number of positions taken in our last response that did not appear to have been addressed in the Examiner's remarks on pages 7-8 of the office action mailed September 26, 2007.

Regarding the Olsen reference, we pointed out that the Examiner was treating database 410 in figure 4 as an equivalent to what we claim. We looked at the cited passages of Olsen and went further, to column 9, lines 12-15. "During installation, the execution engine 484 transforms the process definitions it receives into executable state machines which are saved in database 410." We generally agreed that a repository of executable state machines does not anticipate the claims.

Regarding the Bryan reference, we looked at both version 0.02 and version 0.05, to be clear about the teaching of the reference. We focused on the passages relied on by the Examiner. We pointed out that the article is prophetic, not descriptive of something then in existence. For instance, "It is anticipated that new applications will be created from the spark of XML/EDI implementation. The following list isn't comprehensive, but a starting place for development." We generally agreed that the text on which the Examiner relied was prophetic, not a teaching that would anticipate a claims.

Overall, we agreed to discuss further whether an RCE or appeal would be the most appropriate way to move the case towards allowance. We hope to hear from the Examiner soon.

We thank you again for the interview.

The undersigned can ordinarily be reached at his office at (650) 712-0340 from 8:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. PST, Monday through Friday, and can be reached at his cell phone at (415) 902-6112 most other times.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 29 October 2007

/Ernest J. Beffel, Jr./
Ernest J. Beffel, Jr.
Registration No. 43,489

Haynes Beffel & Wolfeld LLP
P.O. Box 366
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
Telephone: (650) 712-0340
Facsimile: (650) 712-0263